

II. Remarks

This Response accompanies Assignee's request for continued examination in the above-identified application. In an Advisory Action mailed February 5, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the response filed on January 18, 2007 was not entered because the proposed amendments raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Assignee requests that the previously submitted but not entered response remain not entered and that the present response be entered. The substance of the amendments above is identical to those submitted in the not entered response and the remarks below after this first paragraph are identical to those submitted in the not entered response. In addition, Assignee incorporates by reference its prior arguments regarding the primary reference, Fetherstron, cited by the Examiner from its prior responses.

This Response addresses the Office Action mailed on November 21, 2006. A diligent effort has been made to respond to the rejections contained therein, and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in view of this Response.

The amendments to the claims are believed to put the claims into condition for allowance. At the end of the Office Action, Examiner Ouellette suggested the incorporation of steps completed by the external source into the independent claims. The Assignee has attempted to do so with the assistance of Examiner Ouellette in a further teleconference. The remaining amendments made to the claims were directed to issues of form, particularly the enumerations in the claims included for purposes of reference have been amended to take into account the amendments made at Examiner Ouellette's suggestion.

The Assignee would like to thank the Examiner Ouellette for the time spent during the telephonic interview of January 12, 2007 where the Examiner suggested modifications to a draft amendment in order to place the claims into condition for allowance. The Examiner's

suggestion to amend the claim to incorporate the limitation that the process documentation is maintained by the employment law information source external to the employer has been made to all of the independent claims in addition to the amendments proposed in the facsimile draft forwarded. As discussed with Examiner Ouellette, the Assignee believes that the claims, as amended, are further distinguished from U.S. Published Patent Application No. US2004/0010517 filed by Fetherston.

III. Conclusion


For the reasons discussed above, the Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner:

1. withdraw his rejection of pending claims 1 & 3-95; and
2. allow all pending claims so that a patent containing claims 1 & 3-95 may issue in due course.

Because this paper is filed within three months of November 21, 2006, the undersigned believes that no fees are due in connection with this paper. If the undersigned is incorrect in his belief regarding this fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment of fees to deposit account 50-3091, ref E006.P001U1.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if such contact would assist in the further prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted
on February 14, 2007,
WEATHERLY KERVEN & SEIGEL LLC



David S. Kerven
Registration No. 43,712

WEATHERLY KERVEN & SEIGEL LLC
Customer No. 35564
Phone: 770-395-5920
Fax: 770-395-5921
E-mail: service@addipvalue.com